

Remarks

This paper is respectfully submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2004. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The application stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over prior art of record cited by the examiner.

The Examiner rejects claim 1 as a combination of Kumar, Neurath, and Wolfe. The rejection states, "Hence, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include means for assisting a client in formulating a request for proposal to be distributed to attorneys throughout the system, for the obvious advantage of having the request for proposal be in clear and usable form.

The Applicant submits that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680. Most inventions are some type of combination of prior elements which attain some advantage. The rejection does not state where in the prior art is found the desirability of the combination.

The remaining rejections of the other claims are similar, in that they propose that a combination of the references is obvious because they perpetuate an advantage. The Applicant respectfully requests, that if the rejections are maintained, that the Examiner identify where the desirability of the invention is found in the prior art.

Therefore, based on the above arguments, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present invention is an advance in the art. A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several fluid, overlapping strokes, positioned above a horizontal line.

Scott J. Fields
Registration No.: 32,857

Date: January 21, 2005

NATIONAL IP RIGHTS CENTER, LLC
550 Township Line Road, Suite 400
Blue Bell, PA 19422
(610) 680-2301

In the Drawings:

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), for not including reference signs mentioned in the description, namely, Figure 6.

Applicant submits herewith substitute Figures 1-36(b), in accordance with the Examiner's objection, and the Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review.